REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed May 6, 2005. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-9 were pending in the Application. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-9. In order to advance the prosecution of the Application, Applicants have amended Claims 1-4, 6, and 9 and canceled Claims 5, 7, and 8. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 112 Rejections

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as being based on an allegedly non-enabling disclosure. According to the Examiner, a "registry of keywords being built dynamically" is not enabled by the disclosure. Office Action, pp. 2-3. Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's position, in order to advance the prosecution of the present Application, Claim 1 has been amended to remove the allegedly unsupported element. As such, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn

Claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite due to the fact that the claims did not indicate "who or what [was] 'analyzing a macro language expression.'" Office Action , p. 3. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to remove this claim language. As such, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite due to the inclusion of the claim language "executing the code." Office Action, p. 3. According to the Examiner, this claim language was vague and unclear. Claims 1, 3, and 9 have been amended, as suggested by the Examiner, to remove this alleged ambiguity. As such, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-4, 6, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Aho, Alfred V.; Sethi, Ravi; and Ullman, Jeffrey D.; "Compilers: Principles, Techniques, and Tools" ("*Aho*"), in view of Hyde, Peter, "White Paper: Creating Applications with the WebHub VCL" ("*Hyde*"), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,295,059

issued to Brooks et al, ("*Brooks*"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,742,828 issued to Canady et al. ("*Canady*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons stated below.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all claim limitations must be taught or proposed by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974). Applicants respectfully submit that each and every element of Claims 1-4, 6, and 9 is not found within the references cited by the Examiner.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

> A method for providing an extensible macro language comprising:
> determining, based on a predetermined syntax of a macro language, one or more keywords in a macro language expression, each keyword being associated with an extended macro command;
> retrieving, from a registry of keywords and associated executable codes, an executable code associated with each keyword in the macro language statement; and
> executing each retrieved executable code to run the extended macro command associated with each of the one or more keywords in the macro language expression without recompiling the macro language.

Applicants respectfully submit that the *Aho-Hyde-Brooks-Canady* combination proposed by the Examiner fails to teach, suggest, or disclose each element of Claim 1. For example, the *Aho-Hyde-Brooks-Canady* combination fails to teach, suggest, or disclose "determining, based on a predetermined syntax of a macro language, one or more keywords in a macro language expression, each keyword being associated with an extended macro command." Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the sections of *Aho* relied on by the Examiner have nothing to due with keywords associated with extended macro commands and, instead, merely describe syntax analysis in a compiler in at a high level. *Aho*, pp. 6-7. In fact, the only reference to keywords cited by the Examiner discloses little more than programming language keywords (*i.e.*, "if," "while," and "begin"). *Aho*, p. 183. These keywords, however, are not associated with extended macro commands. In fact, nothing in *Aho* discloses any sort of "keyword" associated with an "extended macro command" as recited in Claim 1.

The *Aho-Hyde-Brooks-Canady* combination proposed by the Examiner also fails to teach, suggest, or disclose "retrieving, from a registry of keywords and associated executable codes, an executable code associated with each keyword in the macro language statement." In support of this rejection, the Examiner merely stated that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a registry of keywords, such as the one used by the C programming language, into *Aho*. Besides the fact that the Examiner fails to provide any support for this assertion, even if one were to incorporate a registry of keywords, such as the one used by the C programming language, into *Aho*, the resulting combination still fail teach, suggest, or disclose "retrieving, from <u>a registry of keywords and associated executable codes</u>, an executable code associated with each keyword." (emphasis added). As stated in the Office Action, the C programming language includes a registry of 33 keywords. Office Action, p. 5. This registry, however, does not include associated executable codes. Because of this, it would be impossible to retrieve "an executable code associated with each keyword" from such a registry.

Perhaps in an attempt to overcome this deficiency, in the Office Action the Examiner also states that *Canady* "teaches a registry of keywords having one or more keywords and one or more associated codes." Office Action, p. 10. The Examiner, however, failed to designate as nearly as practicable the particular part of *Canady* that is relied on to reject the pending claims as required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2). Even if one were to overlook this deficiency, Examiner's assertion that *Canady* discloses "a registry of keywords and associated executable codes" as recited in Claim 1 is completely erroneous. Rather than teaching, suggesting, or disclosing a registry of keywords and associated executable codes, *Canady* instead discloses method for compiling source code including application defined expressions. *Canady*, col. 2, ll. 33-35. Although *Canady* does disclose a symbol table and application libraries used in this method, these are not a "registry of keywords [associated with extended macro commands] and associated executable codes" as recited in Claim 1. *Canady*, col. 3, l. 54 - col. 4, l. 5. In fact, nothing in *Canady* discloses any sort of keywords associated with extended macro commands or a registry of such keywords.

The *Aho-Hyde-Brooks-Canady* combination proposed by the Examiner also fails to teach, suggest, or disclose "executing the executable code to run the extended macro command associated with the keyword <u>without recompiling the macro language</u>." Contrary

to the Examiner's assertion, executing the executable code to run the extended macro command without recompiling the macro language is not well-known in the art. Furthermore, the sections of *Hyde* relied on by the Examiner in support of this rejection merely disclose using WebHub macros so that a website may be maintained "without any need for Delphi code changes or recompilation." *Hyde*, p. 10. The Delphi code referred to by *Hyde*, however, is not a macro language. Instead, Delphi is software development package that may be used in conjunction with the WebHub application. Therefore, nothing in *Hyde* teaches, suggests, or discloses executing an executable code to run an extended macro command without recompiling the macro language. For at least the reasons discussed above, the *Aho-Hyde-Brooks-Canady* combination proposed by the Examiner fails to teach, suggest, or disclose each and every element of Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claim 1 is improper, and respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claim 3 recites "a parser operable to determine, based on a predetermined syntax of a macro language, one or more keywords embedded within a macro language expression, each keyword being associated with an extended macro command" and "a registry of keywords and associated executable codes, including one or more keywords and one or more executable codes, each keyword being associated with a respective one of the executable codes." Therefore, for similar reasons discussed above with regard to Claim 1, the *Aho-Hyde-Brooks-Canady* combination proposed by the Examiner fails to teach, suggest, or disclose each of these elements. As such, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claim 3 is improper and respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 3 be withdrawn.

Claim 9 recites "determining, based on a predetermined syntax of a macro language, one or more keywords in a macro language expression, each keyword being associated with an extended macro command" and "retrieving, from a registry of keywords and associated executable codes, an executable code associated with each keyword in the macro language expression." Therefore, for similar reasons discussed above with regard to Claim 1, the *Aho-Hyde-Brooks-Canady* combination proposed by the Examiner fails to teach, suggest, or disclose each of these elements. As such, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claim 9 is improper and respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 9 be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 4, and 6 depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claims 1 and 3. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claims 2, 4, and 6 are allowable, for example, for similar reasons discussed above with regard to Claims 1 and 3, and respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 2, 4, and 6 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that this Application is in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims. Although no fees are believed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts, L.L.P. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of the Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant

Thomas J. Frame
Reg. No. 47,232
Phone: (214) 953-6675

Date: _August 5, 2005_

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer No.: **05073**
Attorney Docket No. 063170.6308